DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 345 591 HE 025 360

AUTHOR Campbell, Malcolm B.
TITLE Non-University Sectors and the Provision of Higher Education in OECD Countries: Problematics of Articulation.
PUB DATE Mar 92
NOTE 42p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Comparative and International Education Society (Annapolis, MD, March 12-15, 1992).
PUB TYPE Reports - General (140) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Access to Education; Developed Nations; *Educational Needs; *Educational Policy; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Labor Education; Labor Force; *Nontraditional Education; Postsecondary Education; *Public Policy
IDENTIFIERS Organisation for Economic Cooperation

ABSTRACT

This paper identifies issues currently arising in efforts to coordinate public policy concerning competing sectors of postsecondary education in the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development Countries (OECD). It is presented as a result of the OECD's advisement that these industrialized countries need to further strengthen education and training of the labor force. The issues center on questions relative to student accessibility, emergence of a third sector based largely on propriety education, and "the blurring of institutional boundaries" between traditional non-university sectors coupled with the trend toward vocationalism characteristic of new configurations of higher education provision. It is noted that government-sanctioned public policies, not market forces exclusively, should guide the formation of comprehensive and total post-secondary provision, especially as the policies of industrialized countries center on the articulation of competing sectors involved in little-noted realignments of function and purpose. The database for the paper is composed of studies from the following OECD countries: Australia, Austria, Canada, Finland, France, Western Germany, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and the United States. (GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED345591

Non-University Sectors and the Provision of Higher Education in OECD Countries: Problematics of Articulation

Paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the Comparative and International Education Society, Annapolis, Maryland, March 12-15, 1992, by Dr. Malcolm B. Campbell, Professor of Education, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio 43403-0251.

Please do not cite without permission.

HE 025 360

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

MALCOLM B. CAMPBELL

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract: Non-University Sectors and the Provision of Higher Education in OECD Countries: Problematics of Articulation

The 24-member nation Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development recently advised the industrial countries to strengthen "further education and training of the labor force." This charge to constituent members occurred concurrently with the publication of an OECD-sponsored study of the non-university sector (NUS) of the postsecondary education systems of industrialized nations, a report urging more activist governmental policies in the expansion of postsecondary opportunity. The purpose of this paper is to identify issues which currently arise in efforts to coordinate public policy toward what are still, two decades after the unprecedented expansion of the 1960s and early 1970s, competing sectors of postsecondary education. These issues center on questions relative to student accessibility, emergence of a third sector based largely on proprietary education, and "the blurring of institutional boundaries" between traditional non-university and university sectors coupled with the trend toward vocationalism characteristic of new configurations of higher education provision.

Government-sanctioned public policies, not market forces exclusively, should guide the formation of comprehensive and total post-secondary provisions especially as the policies of industrialized countries center on the articulation of competing sectors involved in little noted realignments of function and purpose. OECD country studies from Austria, Australia, Canada, Finland, France, Western Germany, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and the United States are the database for this paper.

Malcolm B. Campbell
Bowling Green State University

PC:15

A. Background: Constraints on the Articulation of FET and NUS Strata of Higher Education in OECD Countries.

At a time when the 24 member nations of the Organization for Economic Cooperation (since September 30, 1961, the chief European-based economic policy think tank for first world industrialized nations and successor to the Marshall Plan-centered Organization for European Economic Cooperation) are experiencing massive reconfigurations of their postsecondary education systems due to numerous factors, not the least of which are related to changing economic markets and social demands, OECD, in two July, 1991, reports has issued a clarion call for substantive reformation within the postsecondary education sectors: further education and training as well as non-university strata.

The published summary of OECD's June, 1991, high-level Intergovernmental Conference on Further Education and Training of the Labor Force and the OECD-sponsored Alternatives to Universities (July, 1991) raise serious public policy issues regarding problematics of articulation between what are still, two decades after the unprecedented expansion of the 1960s and early 1970s, competing sectors of postsecondary education. This essay seeks to clarify these public policy issues, concerns relative to student accessibility, emergence of a so-called "third sector" of higher education (Kakusho Gakko in Japanese), "the blurring of institutional boundaries" between traditional non-university and university sectors, and the trend toward vocationalism characteristic of new configurations of higher education provision, a concern very evident in what Martin Trow elsewhere has called "the 'Americanization' of European higher education."[1]

The OECD report on "further education and training of the labor force" asks the further education and training (hereafter, FET) sectors of member nations to improve and to find more appropriate strategies for evaluating working skills of those caught in a "dualism" in employment.

> Two patterns in the occupational composition of employment are observed. In one, jobs for workers who are least qualified are disappearing; in the other, much of the middle levels in work organizations are disappearing. Both patterns contribute to a "dualism" in employment, that isolates increasingly the least qualified from secure and rewarding jobs.[2]

The report states that a renegotiation of the social contract is a chief means of overcoming labor market dislocations caused by underinvestment in human capital. In this renegotiation (more about which later) FET should play a pivotal role from a public policy perspective. Although it states the theme of maximum investment in human capital differently, the OECD-sponsored Alternatives to Universities similarly stresses the need for renegotiation, albeit in narrower focus.

Alternatives to Universities reviews the development and growth of the non-university sector (hereafter, NUS) in the higher education systems of principally ten OECD member nations: Austria, Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany (prior to German reunification), Japan, New Zealand, the Netherlands, Norway, the United Kingdom, and the United States. NUS, governmentally created in the 1960 and 1970s to provide a more practical and vocationally-centered curricula than universities, early on acquired the status of "less noble" institutions regardless of type of curricular provision: "binary" (adopted in the United Kingdom),

"multipurpose" (exemplified by the community college movement in Canada and the United States), and "specialized" (characterized by continental European institutions offering below first-degree-level qualification such as the French Instituts Universitaires de Technologie and the German Fachhochschulen). Alternatives to Universities claims that the gap in status assumptions between the "less noble" NUS and the "noble" university sector has closed with university curriculum provision assuming characteristics of NUS curriculum provision: chiefly, a growing awareness of community and regional responsibility in association with increased accent on applied research, business and industrial linkages, and enlarged vocational orientation. Alternatives to Universities cautions NUS, however, not to remain content with newly acquired prestige:

> ...NUS institutions will have to rely for their strength increasingly on their greater flexibility and their capacity to develop and maintain a different type of quality, while responding to both the accelerated changes in student demand and employment requirements.[3]

Like the recent OECD report on strengthening FET in member nations, Alternatives to Universities calls for a renegotiation of social contractual assumptions regarding the provisioning of postsecondary education in industrialized nations, renegotiation which undoubtedly will modify substantively concerns regarding the quality of provision in both private (the so-called market-driven sector) and public sectors. A useful way to examine the contours of this renegotiation, specifically issues relative to student accessibility, emergence of a privatized "third sector," the blurring of NUS and university sectors, and increased trends in OECD member nations' systems of higher education towards vocationalism is to view renewed calls for quality

in postsecondary provision through the perspective of Martin Trow's "Americanization" of higher education in Western Europe, referred to earlier.[4]

Trow anchors his conception of the "Americanization" of Western European higher education systems "and their outposts elsewhere in the world (including Japan)" in three broad trends: the further differentiation of interinstitutional and intrainstitutional function in higher education; continued growth and democratization in European higher education resulting in closer organizational links between FET, NUS, and universities; and the emergence in Western European nations of strong university presidents, the latter a result of the renegotiation of institutional mission, perhaps a by-product of the collapse of a pre-World War II consensus of higher education mission. Trends, however, do not probabilities make.

Trowian trends in Western European higher education have occurred in societies moving from "elite access" to "mass access" in student enrollments from three through six per cent of the appropriate chronological age cohort to "the entry of 15, 25, and even 35 per cent of the age grade." Trow admits that, in this drive toward mass access to higher education, Western European nations are not quickly to "Americanize." In his scenario of the next few decades European nations will not readily surrender the status assumptions generated by public authorities monopoly or near-monopoly of higher education provision, the so-called "constraining focus of public authority." Secondly, in addition to what Western Europeans see as the flaws of diversity governed by unregulated market focus, "Americanization" will face oppositional factors such as the lack of articulation or

rationalization between competing sectors of higher education provision as well as Kingsley Amis's aphorism, "more means worse," an indictment posited nowadays at the "adult," "mature," or "non-traditional" clientele for higher education.

Trow asserts that the "Americanization" of higher education in Western Europe is present especially in a growing awareness of the needs of business and industry within the various strata of the higher education sector in return for increased investment by business and industry in that sector. He is not sanguine, however, about the adoption in Western Europe of a competitive, market-driven and rationalized ("supply creates demand") "multipurpose" model of postsecondary education.[5] The OECD-sponsored reports on FET and NUS strata in member nations' higher education systems share Trow's reserve: the missions of FET and NUS need renegotiation. The lack of renegotiation of purpose may prove the most significant constraint on articulation of postsecondary strata.

B. Problematics with the Renegotiation of Mission in FET and NUS Strata of Higher Education.

In November, 1990, OECD's Ministerial Education Committee met in Paris after a six-year hiatus. After consultation with OECD's Business and Industry Advisory Committee (BIAC) and the Trade Union Advisory Committee (TUAC) the Ministers issued a joint communique in which they identified challenges facing the development of education and training in OECD nations during the 1990s, principally four: improvement of the flexibility, quality, and structure of provision; recognition of the centrality of education and training in economic and social progress; awareness of the impact of international

relations relative to global environmental and health problems, emerging patterns of international movements of labor and migration, and newly industrializing economies outside the OECD area on national education and training policies; as well as the development of an educated citizenry participating in "information" societies, democratic societies, leisure societies, value-laden societies, societies in which "the very quality of life and the environment is a major challenge for the 1990s." Concluded the Ministers:

> These...challenges make learning pivotal to contemporary progress. Initial education and training systems need to be of such universally high quality that all young people secure the foundation of knowledge, skills, understanding, and values to enable their full participation in meeting these different challenges. To do so, they should acquire the ability to learn and relearn. Widespread and flexible opportunities need...to be available to build on that foundation through education and training, formal and non-formal, organized recurrently in accordance with the broad aim of lifelong learning.[6] (Emphasis added)

These challenges, the Education Ministers accented, should result in the creation of learning societies in which all individuals will learn actively and continuously during their lives. Policy implications for FET and NUS are numerous.

The OECD Ministerial Education Committee in November, 1990, while recognizing no single trend in policy debate and development regarding "high quality education and training for all," defined the following policy aims regarding post-secondary education and training as common to the OECD area: quality provision as a central component of adult education, enterprise training, higher education, and vocational programs; the widening of access to the "educationally under-served;" the improvement and maintenance of literacy skills; coherence in curricular provision and avoidance of curriculum overload in further,

higher, and recurrent education and training; improvement in the attractiveness and quality of teaching in education and training; the formation of comprehensive education and training statistics especially in the fields of adult education, early childhood education, and private education (whether publicly subsidized or not); enhancement of assessment and evaluation processes centered on student assessment, teacher appraisal, and employment qualifications; increased levels of investment in education and training R & D; enhancement of the international dimension of education and training policies; and "new approaches" (unspecified) to the financing of post-school education and training. The OECD Education Ministers concluded their laundry list of policy directives with the observation: "The challenges of the 21st century will not be met in a spirit of 'more of the same'."[7] Renegotiation of mission in the FET and NUS strata of post-secondary education is paramount.

The June, 1991, Intergovernmental Conference on FET of the Labor Force pointed to emergent problematics of redefining mission: construction of "active" societies, "active" labor market policies, and "active" forms of work organization together with appropriately educated populations and qualified labor forces; the development of initial education and training programs providing qualifications for entry-level employment, job-related learning, and full participation in FET, in short a commitment to life-long learning, expressed in terms of workplace needs as well as broader cultural and social contexts; and closure of the gap between haves and have-nots.[8] Each problematic presents public policy, issues in the articulation of post-secondary strata of FET and NUS.

In its July, 1991, report on NUS, Alternatives to Universities the OECD Secretariat accents a relative decline in the attraction and prestige of conventional university-based academic programs and the emergence of "employment relevant" vocationally oriented programs, possibilities in higher education centered on economic development in the broader society and fashioned by job-related requisites and changing student choices and preferences. States the Secretariat: "Such programs have not only become more closely integrated into higher education over the past 15 years, but have done so by consolidating a position based...on values and functions distinct from those of the traditional universities."[9] The Secretariat eschews recommending specific values and functions prescriptively for NUS. Nevertheless, there is common ground with the OECD-sponsored Intergovernmental Conference on FET of the Labor Force, especially in the identification of problematics associated with the renegotiation of NUS mission.

The OECD Secretariat in Alternatives to Universities stresses the social concern of utilizing NUS to equalize life chances in a more democratic and open higher education system. As NUS acquires higher status, argues the Secretariat, it must not become an "academic and social apartheid" (emphasis original). The gap between the haves, highly-qualified applicants, and the have-nots, applicants from disadvantaged backgrounds who do not possess conventional entry qualifications, must be closed. Cautions the Secretariat:

> Whereas in the past, attempts to cope with this question mainly involved structural reforms, it is suggested that greater attention...be paid to the organization and structure of studies and to the links and coordination between the different programs in order to deal with this complex and pervasive social issue.[10]

Equalization of student access and recruitment patterns is not the only common mission renegotiation accent in the 1991 OECD-sponsored reports on FET and NUS.

Unlike the stated commitment of the OECD Intergovernmental Conference on FET and the November, 1990, OECD Education Ministers communique, "High Quality Education and Training for All," Alternatives to Universities does not specifically enunciate a philosophy of lifelong learning. The OECD Secretariat leaves little doubt, however, that member nations' policies toward NUS must embrace the concept of recurrent education. Concluding that NUS is currently seeking a concept of vocational education "ensuring" that NUS graduates "are capable and motivated to acquire new skills and qualifications throughout their lifetime," the OECD Secretariat observes:

> ...(B)oth from a social equity and from an employment perspective, it seems essential that the structure and organization of studies enable students and graduates to move across sectors and institutions, allow for alteration between work and study, as well as later re-entry into higher education on the basis of a variety of learning and work experiences.[11]

The OECD Secretariat is less than optimistic about the implementation of flexible entry and reentry policies of access to higher education in OECD member nations, citing institutional differentiation, hierarchy, and stratification as obstacles.

While the OECD Ministers of Education and the OECD Secretariat define access opportunities in postsecondary within the context of public policy targeted at reduction of the gap in member nations between haves and have-nots and implementation of lifelong learning, studies of the FET and NUS strata of the postsecondary education

sector of OECD member nations underscore the fragility of both in contemporary higher education systems of the Western industrialized nations. Although not exclusively, this fragility emerges from issues relative to student accessibility, emergence of a third sector or stratum of postsecondary education operationalized in proprietary education, "the blurring of institutional boundaries "between traditional NUS and university sectors, and the trend toward vocationalism characteristic of new configurations of higher education provision. As the OECD Secretariat notes, these issues result from a "discrepancy" in member nations between the political and social goals of democraticizing higher education opportunity, on the one hand, and the implementation of these goals in differentiated systems of higher education. This discrepancy highlights the use of FET and NUS to equalize life-chances, defined by OECD in terms of educational opportunities and not educational outcomes. Key to resolving this discrepancy is the issue of student access for postsecondary education.[12]

C. Student Accessibility to FET and NUS in OECD Countries: Some Issues

The OECD country reports on student accessibility to FET present an ambiguous portrait of opportunities in this stratum of postsecondary education. Since 1971 France has recognized the right of individuals to continuing adult education and training and by 1986 had one person in five in the labor force (excluding public service employees) in FET, provided by firms and chambers of industry and commerce under sponsorship of the French Ministry of Labor. In Finland 90% of comprehensive school leavers elect FET, although adult

education remains underdeveloped. Technical and further education (TAFE) remains inaccessible for significant disadvantaged groups in Australia: Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders, women, the disabled, and people from non-English speaking backgrounds. Above 50% of the adult population (aged 25 years and over) participate in a diversified system of Swedish adult education inclusive of formal adult education, popular adult education, labor market training, together with in-service training and staff development, all premised on allocation of special resources earmarked for the educationally disadvantaged (a policy strongly supported by the Swedish Trade Union Confederation and The Swedish Confederation of Professional Employees). Accessibility to FET remains ambiguous in the collective portrait of other OECD member nations as well.

Prior to unification, a former West German Minister for Education and Science, Jurgen W. Möllemann, stated that the promotion of FET for target German populations, especially the unemployed, the long-term unemployed, and women, was critical to the end-of-1980s debate over the extension and structure of FET, especially further vocational education and training in Germany. Improving access to FET has concerned public officials in Canada, for example the Manitoba Access programs administered by the Manitoba Department of Education since 1970 and targeted at disadvantaged groups defined within the Canadian Jobs Strategy introduced by the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission in 1985: women, native peoples (Indian, Inuit, and Métis), the disabled, and "visible minorities (ethnic groups readily distinguished from the majority)."

The United States contribution to OECD's project on FET of the Labor Force, "The American Learning Enterprise in Transition," underscores the need to replace an "extreme" bias toward youth in popular thinking about human capital development with a "genuine" acceptance of learning as a "lifespan" activity (emphasis original). New Zealand experiences differential rates of participation in its Post-Compulsory Education and Training Sector (PCET) for women, Maori, Pacific Island people, those in other age groups, people from lower socioeconomic backgrounds, and immigrants of non-English speaking background. Britains FET sector in 1986/87 absorbed the bulk of students in postcompulsory education (4,051 million, contrasted with 1,005 million in higher education), the majority of FET participants involved on a part-time basis. Britain's FET scheme includes special initiatives targeted the disabled, ethnic minority groups, and those of non-English speaking background. Access to FET in the Netherlands is governed by attention to the economic function of the adult population, influenced by chronic unemployment and austerity policies of the Dutch government resulting in policies in the postcompulsory sector of education reflecting market orientation and privitization. Such concerns replace the accent in Dutch adult education provision of the 1970s on FET "as a second-chance provision...aimed at people with educational disadvantages." Emerging trends in access to FET provision clearly reflect an ambiguity in relation to the question of what balance in structuring opportunity should be struck between "manpower" demands and "social" demands.[13] A similar ambiguity characterizes access patterns to NUS in OECD member nations.

An underlying reason for the development of NUS in the 1960s and early 1970s was to accommodate a clientele more diversified in terms of age, ethnic and socio-economic background, and gender than conventional university-bound clientele. OECD country reports indicate that the NUS-targeted clientele are present in and taking advantage of NUS opportunity, although presence is not occurring without attendant issues.

Alternatives to Universities notes that NUS clientele broadly consist of three student categories: secondary school graduates qualified for university entrance, but choosing direct enrollment in NUS instead; adult enrollees in NUS on a first-time basis, with and without school-related qualifications; and students interested in pursuing some form of continuing education.[14] While some OECD member nations have experienced steady-state growth in NUS clientele or even stagnation (Austria is an example of the latter) in the last decade, most OECD member nations report considerable expansion of clientele in the NUS sector.

Canadian rates of increase in full-time student enrollment in postsecondary education illustrate that the Canadian NUS, for which the provinces are responsible largely through a network of some 200 community colleges, experienced an increase in full-time student numbers from 1970 to 1985 of 156,400 (from 166,100 in 1969-1970 to 322,500 in 1985), compared with an increase in the Canadian university sector of 186,230 (from 294,100 in 1969-1970 to 470,330 in 1985). The presence of female participation in Canadian postsecondary education is conspicuous: "Women now constitute a little more than half of college enrollment and a little less than half of university

enrollment."[15] While female participation in the West German Fachhochschulen stratum of NUS prior to reunification was fairly low (3,658 female contrasted with 30,000 male students in engineering subjects, for example, in 1985; the proportion of women in business studies and the social sciences about a third of male enrollment), generally speaking, the Fachhochschulen enrolled a chronologically older population and a larger proportion of clientele from low-income families than the universities (32 percent versus 21 percent).

Japan's NUS, consisting of junior colleges (tanki daigaku), technical colleges (koto senmon gakko), and special training schools (senshu gakko), have experienced dramatic growth in clientele, especially women, not served by universities. This is especially true in the Japanese junior colleges, established in 1949, where the percentage of male graduates has decreased from 45.3% of the student population in 1955 to 7.6% in 1987, having reached a low percentage of 7.2% in 1985. Dutch authorities report that fewer women are now entering the university sector than are entering the non-university institutes, consisting of higher vocational institutes, the Open University, and the so-called "third sector." Data for assessing the socio-economic origins of clientele in the Dutch NUS is not available; what figures are available in a 1977 cohort show little change from a higher participation rate of clientele from higher socio-economic strata. Access issues in New Zealand's 25-year-old NUS are apparent. Traditional standards of entry, academic ability and aptitude, prevented socially-disadvantaged groups from participation in New Zealand's (Aotearoa's) formal NUS, which in 1987 consisted of 20 metropolitan and regional polytechnics, two national polytechnics, two

"embryo" polytechnics [all patterned after the American community college], 11 youth learning centers, 270 secondary schools community education programs, and 13 rural education activities programs. Since 1984, the New Zealand Department of Education has encouraged polytechnics to develop some 135 foundation skills-oriented courses and 263 "employment-rich" courses for those who conventionally do not participate in NUS: people at risk of unemployment, those from low socio-economic background, women, Maori, and Pacific Islanders.

Norway's recent NUS configuration, shaped in the 1970s and 1980s by successive Conservative and Labor government efforts to consolidate, decentralize, and democratize provision, has participated in a student increase in higher education of 25 percent between 1974 and 1984, 80 percent of that increase occurring in the NUS sector. Issues of access exist within this growth pattern:

> A surplus of applicants in many fields make the NUIs (non-university institutions)...as selective as most university studies. The NUI-students are on the average somewhat older at entry and their social backgrounds seem to be <u>somewhat</u> more egalitarian than that of university students, although the difference is not significant when comparisons are made with university studies in corresponding fields.[16]

Access issues are also of paramount importance in the United Kingdom and the United States.

The British Government's major policy objectives in higher education provision during the 1980s included the objective of maintaining "access for all who wanted it and were suitably qualified," to quote a 1984 Department of Education and Science <u>Annual Report</u>. In Britain the NUS, including "advanced further education" (as it is termed) in some 30 polytechnics in England and Wales colleges of art, teacher training colleges, or colleges of higher

education, some 20 independent "voluntary" colleges affiliated with religious foundations and originally concerned with teacher education, the Scottish Central Institutions, and further education provided in Northern Ireland by the five Education and Library boards established in 1973, has traditionally pursued a policy of "openness," offering access to those with unconventional or no qualifications, alternative qualifications and experience. This policy is a derivative of the Robbins Report's (1963) "social demand" argument that higher education, principally the universities, in Britain should tap hitherto untapped talent pools. But this NUS commitment to access is changing.

> Widening access to higher education is no longer conceived at the start of the 1990s as a crusade to help the educationally and socially deprived... Instead it is seen...as the careful management of burgeoning demand...from standard school leavers and other conventional sources.[17]

The growing number of graduate parents as a spur to increased student demand, the success of the new General Certificate of Secondary Education in encouraging greater numbers of sixteen-year-olds to stay in school, comprehensive reorganization of secondary education, the near-equalization of female and male participation, and the perception of higher education as a desirable commodity, one British critic observes, have contributed to boom times. Peter Scott notes that in the early 1990s the demand seems to be for more not different higher education.

Critics of the British NUS are wondering if, in the transition from local education authority maintenance to support from the newly created Polytechnics and Colleges Funding Council, PCFC institutions will sustain the same commitment to equal opportunities policies and

special access programs they previously did under localized support. This concern for prioritizing higher education access for various configurations of non-conventional student is appropriate within the American NUS sector as well.

Access to the American NUS, consisting primarily of community colleges, often called "democracy's colleges" for their intake of clientele underrepresented in traditional American higher education provision: the over 25-year-old population, African-Americans, and Hispanics, presents special issues. The remarkable growth of the two-year public community college movement (from 13% of total higher education enrollments, including part-time students, in 1960 to 25% by 1970 and 42% by 1980), is seen in the doubling of such institutions between 1966 and 1986, from 565 to 1,224. This growth has paralleled a growing access record of groups traditionally disenfranchised in American higher education. In her OECD-sponsored country study of NUS in the United States Barbara Turlington notes that two-year public community colleges include a greater proportion of minorities, part-time students, and women. Data from the high school graduating class of 1980 show about the same percentages, 12 and 15 respectively, of low socio-economic status (SES) and low-middle SES attending public two-year and four-year institutions. Minority participation in the American community college movement raises a constellation of issues concerning the democratizing of opportunity in the American NUS.

The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges reported (Data Summary, 1988) that during the 1986-1987 academic year 55% of all Hispanics and 43% of all African-Americans enrolled in American colleges and universities were enrolled in two-year

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

institutions (contrasted with 36% of white students). Critics argue that these proportions will increase in the 1990s; community colleges will serve a higher proportion of students who are minority, under prepared and economically disadvantaged."[20] In his recent discussion of "Other People's Children" and their opportunities in the Chicago, Illinois, public schools Jonathan Kozol notes that the noncompletion rate at Chicago's community colleges is 97%: "Of 35,000 students working toward degrees in the community colleges, that serve Chicago, only 1,100 annually complete the program and receive degrees."[21] Critics wonder whether in the United States the community college component of NUS is part of a gateway to increased opportunity or a gatekeeper, screening prospective students for the universities and, in the terminology of the 1970s popularized by Burton R. Clark and others, "cooling them out." Observes Judith S. Eaton:

> A case can be made that there is tracking in higher education based on wealth and birth that limits the credibility one can associate with the rhetoric of opportunity. There are those who argue that this tracking is intentional and that community colleges are important participants in this phenomenon.[22]

This concern can be raised with the national contexts of NUS development other than American.

Over two decades ago OECD, in its initial study of NUS stated that short-cycle higher education institutions (SCIs) were expected to contribute to the democratization of access to higher education through policies designed to equalize educational opportunity rather than educational outcome. SCIs, argued an OECD-sponsored International Meeting on short-cycle Higher Education "...might even represent the major tool by which access to higher education is more widely opened to social groups and classes which in the past were

heavily under-represented in post-secondary institutions."[23] Cautioning against increasing institutional status differences between "noble" and "less noble" institutions and thereby creating a kind of "pseudo-democratization of higher education" the Meeting was reserved in accenting NUS's contribution to broadening access to higher education:

> In many cases...these institutions (SCIs or NUIs-non-university institutions) have not...led to any increase in the democratization of the educational system... (I)t is now clear that equality of educational opportunity is dependent mainly on measures taken at the lower levels of the educational system, and that those taken at the higher education level can have but a marginal effect.[24]

Two decades later not much has changed. Access to FET and NUS is based in OECD countries, with few exceptions, on a "pseudo-democratization of access patterns."

Alternatives to Universities stresses that the utilization of the multifarious education sectors of OECD countries to equalize life-chances results in an apparent discrepancy between the rhetorical sociopolitical goals of democraticizing higher education and the realization of such goals in highly differentiated and not closely articulated systems of higher education. The recent spate of OECD country reports on FET and NUS illustrate that recent (the last decade or so) access patterns to both higher education sectors fall short of the democratization of opportunity expectations placed on them ab initio. In many of the OECD countries market forces, generally, and economic recession pressures, more specifically, may well encourage the recruitment of new participants to FET and NUS from strictly "manpower" concerns. Clearly in recent years the emergence of a "third sector" at the postsecondary level of OECD countries is a

leading example of higher education provision being shaped by unregulated market-driven forces.

D. Emergence of a "Third Sector" in Higher Education Provision: Issues of Articulation in OECD Countries

Perhaps the strongest competitor in financial and human resource deployment in OECD countries over the last two decades has been a "third sector" of postsecondary education. Tuition-charging, supported in some countries by different government agencies and private corporations, appealing currently to a growing number of school-leavers qualified for entrance to conventional FET, NUS, and university strata of higher education, the "third sector" "consists of diverse groups of programs which are predominantly privately organized and financed, which are often of short duration and narrowly vocational, offered by private institutions and industrial firms."[25] Austria's Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs-sponsored business administration and commerce courses for higher secondary schools of general education (HHS) graduates; the pre-unification West German so-called "duale Ausbildung" (dual training scheme) of practically oriented industrial training schemes organized cooperatively with occupational academies (in Baden Württemberg and in Schleswig-Holstein, for example); the Japanese miscellaneous schools (Kakushu Gakko) and university entrance examination preparatory schools (Yobiko); education-by-correspondence institutes recognized and nonrecognized by the Dutch Ministry of Education; New Zealand's Maori-established school of higher learning, Te Wananga o Raukawa, 65 kilometers north of Wellington, providing degree programs in Maori culture, enterprise, and language in-service courses coordinated by

Norweigian Social Security and Labor Market Authorities; British specialist institutions such as the Colleges of Law Tutors, the non-governmentally funded University College in Buckinghamshire, and the United Kingdom-based Ashorne Management Center, originally the in-house training center for the British steel industry; finally, American corporate classrooms and proprietary schools--all represent facets of a consumer-oriented market-drive "third sector" of postsecondary education--a phenomenon which makes the articulation of higher education provision in OECD countries all the more challenging.

The OECD Secretariat notes, as do several OECD country studies of NUS, that information about the functions, mission, and scope of the "third sector" is limited, and, one would add, in some instances altogether missing or insufficient. In the two countries in which "third sector" data can be easily quantified, Japan and the United States, different portraits of the prominence of this sector in higher education emerge. In Japan, the Kakushu Gakko, with roots in the Meiji era and given legislative parity of esteem with the occupationally-oriented Senshu Gakko (special training schools) with Liberal Democratic Party support in the Japanese Diet during the 1975 legislative session, has declined dramatically in number of institutions from 8,089 in 1960 to 3,918 in 1987, and in the number of enrolled students from 1,383,712 in 1965 to 466,063 in 1987, both declines OECD attributing to high costs. On the other hand, the OECD country study on NUS in the United States notes that proprietary trade and technical schools are the fastest growing sector of American postsecondary education, "both in number of students enrolled and in expenditures," 6,672 of the 7,645 proprietary schools in the United

States have less than two-year programs and 997 of these institutions were in California alone.

In his "Review of Main Developments," the first part of OECD's recent Alternatives to Universities, Claudius Gellert observes that "third sector" postsecondary education may become "a major challenge" to both the NUS and the traditional university sector. Gellert reasons, however: "A lot will depend on the future pace of economic and technological change and on the relative flexibility of the other sectors to adapt to these structural modifications and demands." The OECD Secretariat agrees with Gellert: the "third sector" is a viable sector in postsecondary education, especially in areas where governments have circumscribed a direct role in responding to individual as well as socioeconomic and sociopolitical claims. Cautions the Secretariat: "Sooner or later, governments will find it necessary to take more explicit cognizance of developments in the third sector, if only to ensure appropriate quality control."[26] There is some evidence that governments in OECD countries are recognizing the not altogether inconsiderable role the third sector has assumed in higher education provision over the past two or three decades. Recognition, however, is mixed.

"Third sector" provision in OECD countries garners recognition on a famine or feast basis. The New Zealand Department of Education in an OECD-sponsored study on New Zealand's NUS states that the third-sector of non-university education "is neither a prime competitor in the higher education market nor a strong paradigm of further development of the non-university sector in particular." On the other hand, in Japan's revised School Education Law of 1975, a

number of private business schools were given legal status within the formal Japanese NUS as Senshu Gakko, special occupational or training schools. These upgraded miscellaneous schools, still lacking public funding and student transfer policies, have become popular havens for unemployed Japanese 18-year-olds and those 18-year-olds who do not obtain a university place. Both cohorts are increasing in number; students in Senshu Gakko courses requiring graduation from upper secondary schools as qualification to admission has grown from 90,619 in 1976, the first year of operation for these special training schools, to 483,243 in 1987, the number of institutions from 893 in 1976 to 3,152 in 1987. Government recognition of the"third sector" of postsecondary education provision is not, however, always positive; the "third sector" model is not viewed as one necessarily to emulate in the public sector.[27]

The OECD-sponsored country study on the American NUS suggests that community, junior, and technical colleges may face increasing competition from the "third sector." This competition is promised on the assumption that, while student costs in the proprietary school sector are much higher than in publicly supported NUS, the cost factors will lessen in significance compared to the "more relevant," (implying a lack of liberal arts course requirements) and shorter programs. This contention presumes the continuation of federal student aid programs for proprietary school-based students. Increasingly, these programs are sharply criticized by government providers.

In May, 1991, the United States Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations reported on abuses in the federal student aid programs

available within the proprietary school sector of American postsecondary education. Citing conflicts of interest in the accreditation process, ineffective oversight, and patterns of abuse in the "third sector" proprietary schools, schools defined as "private, for-profit trade and other vocational institutions that provide postsecondary education," the Subcommittee noted that in the 1980s proprietary school loans defaulted at a rate five times that of traditional two- and four-year postsecondary institutions. The Subcommittee's investigation found "major" flaws in United States Department of Education monitoring of the use of the guaranteed student loan program, established pursuant to Title IV of President Lyndon Baines Johnson's November, 1965, Higher Education Act. The Subcommittee concluded, however, that the major issue confronting proprietary school provision was one of quality of education, not one of student numbers. Subcommittee staff, citing "exorbitant" salaries for employees and owners together with "huge" profits for proprietary schools in the 1980s quoted one proprietary school president as saying: "Quality education and higher earnings are two masters. You can't serve both." Speaking directly to what it viewed as a well-intentioned, yet "inefficient, ineffective, and far too costly" student aid program, the Subcommittee specifically linked the question of student accessibility to that of quality in the proprietary strata of the American "third sector" and found quality lacking.

> Unquestionably, the guaranteed student loan program has vastly expanded accessibility to education for those Americans who seek it. The value of accessibility, however, depends on what it is that one is being given access to. On that point, the Subcommittee found that the program has failed, particularly in the area of proprietary schools, to insure that federal dollars are providing quality, and not merely quantity, in education.[28]

The United States Senate's Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations concluded its investigatory report on abuses in federal student aid programs with the recommendation that Congress should require the President (with the Secretary of Education's assistance) to report promptly on questions dealing with determining nationally needed skills, developing greater respect and support for skills training, and promotion of "the most effective balance between skills training and academic forms of postsecondary education."[29]

The OECD Secretariat in Alternatives to Universities speaks of the need for governments to assume more explicit recognition of "third sector" developments, "if only to ensure appropriate quality control" and the need to create an appropriate balance between market-driven developments and regulatory practices assuring quality. The OECD-sponsored Intergovernmental Conference on Further Education and Training is silent on these "third sector"-related issues as are the OECD country studies of NUS. The OECD nations will continue to face these issues, however, over the next decade in both the FET and NUS sectors. For example, will the Manpower Services Commission's policy of funding "third sector" projects and proposals in Britain's Department of Education and Science and the Welsh Office co-sponsored PICKUP (a program of support for commercial, industrial, and professional updating) according to the principle of "honeypot management," selective funding to agencies by the Commission based on agency history in successful project submission to the Commission, mitigate a lessening of quality in the United Kingdom's "third sector," which the Department of Education and Science now estimates to include some 300,000 students? As significant to postsecondary

education policy formation is the fact that the traditional university and nonuniversity sectors in Britain compete with the "third sector" for the funding of adult education programs such as PICKUP. Writes John Pratt in the OECD-sponsored country study of Britain's NUS:

> ...(C)onventional boundaries in the British higher education system have become less distinct. Whilst there has always been discussion of the desirability of a 'binary' divide in higher education...there are now [given a diminution in sector distinctiveness in recent years] further ways in which the different sectors overlap. They are acquiring the values, courses and clientele of other sectors--the universities in continuing education, the public sector through training of young people and adults.[30] (Parentheses added)

Clearly the substance of Pratt's commentary points to a third set of issues relative to the problematics of articulation between non-university sectors and the provision of higher education in OECD countries: issues generated by "the blurring of institutional boundaries" between traditional non-university and university sectors coupled with the trends toward vocationalism characteristic of new configurations of higher education provision.

E. <u>The "Blurring of Institutional Boundaries" between Non-university and University Sectors in OECD Countries: The Trend toward Vocationalism in Higher Education Provision</u>

A third problematic, added to those of student accessibility and "third sector" growth, in the articulation of higher education in OECD nations is a phenomenon first observed in the early 1970s. In the 1973 OECD's Directorate for Scientific Affairs' examination of the status of short-cycle higher education, "post-secondary education of a mainly terminal character designed to train students for middle-level manpower positions," in OECD countries emphasis was placed on how the identity of institutionalized short-cycle provision would assume or

seek to assume through a process of "academic drift" the attributes of university status, adhering to a growth pattern established by Britain's Colleges of Advanced Technology and France's University Institutes of Technology. According to this scenario the NUS of the British polytechnics, German Fachhochschulen, Norwegian regional colleges, and the Canadian colleges of applied arts and technology together with the Quebec-based colleges d'enseignement general et professionnel would seek affiliation with the long-cycle academically-oriented and largely autonomous university sector, becoming in the process university-affiliated like the decentralized collegios universitarios in Spain. The OECD Directorate for Scientific Affairs clearly favored a development of NUS separate from the traditional university sector's growth, a development which the Directorate concluded would result in an "integration among equals" rather than "a dangerous uniformization of the system." In the two decades since this assessment of NUS-related identity issues neither attitude has prevailed.[31]

In the twenty or so years since its widespread development in OECD countries NUS has not only come of age, it has achieved an identity through creating missions separate from the university sector. Thus in the pre-unification Federal Republic of Germany there were in 1987 123 Fachhochschulen (including 99 general Fachhochschulen and 24 Fachhochschulen for public administration or Verwaltungsfachhochschulen) compared to seven comprehensive universities (Gesamthochschulen) in addition to 61 traditional West German universities.[32]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

As Ulrich Teichler observes, while the position of Fachhochschulen in overall West German higher education policy development was nebulous (all Fachhochschulen in one Land having a single vote in the West German Rectors' Conference and each university one vote), a legally equal status, not necessarily a parity in educational goals with other higher education institutions, was achieved. New entrant students to Fachhochschulen increased in the 1980s and Fachhochschulen graduates were well received in the employment system, the latter, Teichler notes, an unchallenged claim in public debate. The Fachhochschulen sectors vocational orientation and Verschulung (school-type learning and teaching arrangements - factors viewed negatively), coupled with an applied research base, lessened the prestige of West German NUS. Teichler stated that West German higher education policy debates of the 1980s recognized the "strengthened" Fachhochschulen position in higher education provision, yet the Fachhochschulen still aspired to university status. Ambition to lessen the gaps in functions and status between the Fachhochschule and university professors as a mean of increasing the status of the Fachhochschulen occurred within a context in which a distinctive Fachhochschule curricular thrust, "shorter, more vocationally oriented and more specialized course programs," did not ease, lessen, or eliminate status conflicts between Fachhochschulen and the universities, the former perceiving a need to become more like the latter.[33] In some OECD countries, however, the university sector is assuming attributes of NUS.

Teichler's study of the Fachhochschulen sector of pre-unification West German higher education illustrates how both university and NUS,

even the FET sector, are competing for an increasingly diminished source of new student entrants. Both West German NUS and university sectors at the end of the 1980s "increased their efforts to establish advanced course programs as well as to extend their further education function." While pre-unification West Germany experienced little "reverse transfer" in the 1980s of students from universities to NUS, there is evidence expressed in terms of the lower socio-economic and higher chronological age backgrounds of Fachhochschulen students together with a growing functional independence of the Fachhochschulen within Germany's higher education system that "the future development of the NUS...seems to be secure" and a development which the university sector seeks to imitate.[34] University sector initiation of NUS is an increasing trend in OECD countries.

Most easily observable within the NUS sector, yet also occurring in the FET sector of OECD countries is "the blurring of institutional boundaries" between traditional non-university and university sectors of postsecondary education provision including a trend toward vocationalism - especially the establishment of research links with industry - developing in the university sector, in particular. Comments John Pratt in his OECD-sponsored study of NUS in the United Kingdom:

> The demarcation between traditionally academic and vocational courses which previously broadly delineated university and PSHE (Public Sector Higher Education/NUS) is becoming fragmented. The skills updating field is an acceptable arena for both university and PSHE within which to operate. Science Parks at Aston (a former College of Advanced Technology at Birmingham, England, given university status by the Privy Council) and Cambridge University, and the Industrial Center at Salford indicate a willingness not just by PSHE to foster industrial links. Involvement at postgraduate level with the MSC (the Manpower Services Commission, established by the 1973 Employment and Training

> Act as an agency of the Department of Employment to operationalize public employment and training services) extends across the binary line. At a time when both the public and university sector are under financial constraint, industrial links and MSC sponsorship become a prize neither wishes to lose.[35] (Parentheses added)

This "vocational drift," what the OECD more broadly, and erroneously, refers to as "employment drift," characterizes an increasingly homogenity of mission in FET, NUS, and university sectors of OECD countries.

While Japanese authorities report simultaneously that Japanese postsecondary education maintains a principle of "segregation of niches" between universities and NUS ("...(T)here is scarcely any tendency for the universities to extend their activities into the fields in which NUS and the Third Sector institutions specialize,") and the Japan Scholarship Foundation financed scholarships between Y 29,000 and Y 48,000 per month for students to participate in FET arrangements with national, private, and public universities, clearly there is a trend in OECD countries for FET, NUS, and university sectors becoming less diversified. The success of NUS in meeting community- and regionally-based needs and democraticized access requisites along with short-cycle vocational orientations situated in applied research and industry linkages have become appealing to the university sector. Secondly, the traditional divide between situating vocational/professional education in FET/NUS and the broader concerns of"liberal" academic education in the university sector of OECD countries is eroding. Whether this erosion occurs because of a Habermasian perspective to view theory and practice as social rather than epistemological distinctions or the more recent curricular view that most higher education provision is professional in that subject

content is related to subsequent occupation rather than the internal dynamics of a discipline and "academic," "general," and "professional," distinctions matters of degree rather than kind, the OECD Secretariat recognizes the futility of traditional sector-based planning for higher education.

> The essential issue is to ensure that the higher education as a whole fulfills the multiple functions which modern society requires: providing general and vocational programs, initial and continuing education, short and long courses. It is less important whether these different provisions are offered in the university or the non-university sector, so long as they are catered for, in whatever setting, with a minimum of administrative or organizational barriers.[36] (Emphasis added to "as a whole")

As the OECD Secretariat recognizes, "the blurring of institutional boundaries" between FET, NUS and university sectors in OECD countries together with what Martin Trow has called elsewhere the "Americanization" of higher education provisioned by increasing links with business and industry raises the question of whether it is altogether appropriate to maintain distinctions between the four sectors, including the so-called "third" or proprietary sector, distinctions which currently center on differential patterns of institutional financing and governance. The OECD Secretariat tersely puts the question: "... (W)hat alternative forms of differentiation are feasible...?"[37]

F. Conclusion: "Unity without Uniformity," and "Diversity without Hierarchy" in Postsecondary Education Provision

In a 1973 discussion of identity issues related to the development of long- and short-cycle higher education in OECD countries, Dorotea Furth argued that the university sector could develop two attitudes in its relationship to NUS: either the

universities could accept the short-cycle or NUS institutions as equal partners or the universities could maintain traditional value structures. Stated Furth:

> If...universities take the first attitude, their integration with various types of SCIs (short-cycle institutions) will contribute to the development of a system where unity could be achieved without uniformity, and diversity could exist with a minimum of institutional hierarchy.[38]

Furth's 1973 prescient dictum is yet unrealized; universities in OECD countries have not shared resources, human and otherwise, with the FET, NUS, and "third" sectors, and vice versa. Articulation between the four sectors, cooperation between the four sectors may be enervated in the 1990s by a continuation and extension of competing public and private policies in higher education as well as competition for students and programs across higher education sectors.

What kinds of diversity in higher education provision are warranted in OECD countries remains a critical policy question. One limitation in responding to that question meaningfully is the continued lack of what that peripatetic comparativist George Bereday termed "the method of balanced comparison." The recent spate of OECD country studies of FET and NUS reveal that a "symmetrical confrontation" of available data on student access to FET and NUS, the emergence of the so-called "third" or proprietary sector, and "the blurring of institutional boundaries" across higher education sectors does not yet exist, especially data on the latter two concerns. Bereday eloquently spoke of status divisions in higher education provision.

> The pressure for more university places is being, in part at least, successfully deflected into nonuniversity institutions... The heroic or pathetic efforts at education by the less able or poorer students, by people who work days

> and study nights, are short-changed by bestowal of largely third-rate qualifications. Anyone who has ever watched young persons crowding...into...secretarial schools, community colleges, and other similar institutions must sense that there is something wrong in rewarding so much effort with diplomas which do not have an appropriate intellectual value or social recognition.[39]

In the two decades since Bereday's comment on status differentials in mass higher education "secretarial schools, community colleges, and other similar institutions" have achieved recognition as providers of higher education. It is within this context of a "parity of esteem" within and across the four sectors that the questions of unity within diversity are framed currently.

The Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada-sponsored Commission of Inquiry on Canadian University Education reported in September, 1991, that there should be greater cooperation and coordination between Canadian universities and Canadian community colleges in fashioning programs like that of the Ryerson Polytechnical Institute in Toronto, Ontario. The Ryerson degree courses combine employable skills and general education. Stated the Commission: "Rather than build a series of new institutions to imitate Ryerson Polytechnical, it would make sense for universities and nearby community colleges to jointly plan combination degree courses and to receive provincial assistance for the organization and administration of these complex arrangements."[40] The Commission of Inquiry on Canadian University Education notes the Ryerson's degree programs "attract students from less affluent families who have a need to know that there will be a definable job at the end of the program."

The recent OECD reports on FET and NUS speak of national trends of higher education provision in which the universities' entrance into

pragmatic, job-oriented programs, traditionally the territory of FET and NUS, may result in heightened FET and NUS status, but also increased competition between sectors. If "unity without uniformity" and "diversity without hierarchy" are appropriate targets of higher education planning a number of policy issues arise: What alternative forms of program differentiation are feasible? What interrelations between institutional autonomy and reciprocity are appropriate? Will more institutional diversity ipso facto serve more diverse clienteles? Harold Hodgkinson speaks of the lack of attention to pluralism in American higher education debate.

> We have much debate on pluralism of individuals, but little on pluralistic institutions. Perhaps community colleges should not only look different from flagship research universities, but community colleges in New Mexico should look different from community colleges in Massachusetts. If that kind of diversity prevails in the 1990's, how can you tell a "good" community college from a "bad" one if they're so dissimilar?[41]

Clearly the 1991 OECD reports on FET, NUS, and "third sector" postsecondary education provision have enlivened the debate about the appropriateness of pluralistic institutions of higher education in the United States and the other 23 member nations.

As the OECD-sponsored country reports on FET and NUS affirm, the future of closer articulation between higher education sectors rests in a coordination of "manpower" and "social demand" planning approaches. This coordination will not rise automatically in a market-responsive, privatized higher education provision policy. Abolishing recurrent education sector status differentials, yet maintaining programmatic diversity will require public modes of provision and regulation. Perhaps the 1988 European Community decision to define a uniform three-years-of-study threshold for

recognition of degree programs represents a public policy posture which will discourage cooperation between the sectors, establishing a competitive unity in its place. As Teichler observes, that European community policy has encouraged an "academic drift" of Fachhochschulen toward the German university sector by the German NUS policy of lengthening required periods of study.[42] As the OECD Secretariat concludes in Alternatives to Universities striking the right balance "between market-driven developments and regulatory practices" in higher education provision remains "a major challenge to those charged with the design and implementation of future policies..."[43] "Those charged" should include spokespersons from the public sector and,given increasing trends in some OECD countries for the privatization of higher education provision, not the private sector, business community exclusively.

ENDNOTES

[1]Martin A. Trow and Thorsten Nybom, eds., University and Society: Essays on the Social Role of Research and Higher Education (London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 1991), p. 164.

[2]Intergovernmental Conference on Further Education and Training of the Labor Force," "Conclusions of the Chair" (Paris: OECD Press Division, July, 1991), p. 3.

[3]Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Alternatives to Universities (Paris: Publications Service, OECD, 1991), p. 81.

[4]See page 1.

[5]Martin A. Trow and Thorsten Nybom, eds., University and Society: Essays on the Social Role of Research and Higher Education, especially pp. 166-171.

[6]OECD Press Release, High Quality Education and Training for All (Paris, OECD, November 14, 1990), pp. 3-4. Document Identification: SG/Press (90) 69.

[7]Ibid, p. 8.

[8]Intergovernmental Conference on Further Education and Training of the Labor Force, "Conclusions of the Chair" (Paris, OECD Press Division, July, 1991), pp. 4-5.

[9]Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Alternatives to Universities (Paris, Publications Service, OECD, 1991), p. 72.

[10]Ibid., p. 75.

[11]Ibid., p. 76.

[12]Ibid., p. 37.

[13]OECD country studies FET helpful to this overview of access include: "Assessment and Recognition of Skills and Competencies: Developments in France," p. 3; "Country Report: Finland," p. 1; "Country Report: Australia," p. 19; "Country Report: Sweden," p. 20; "Country Report: Germany," pp. 10-11; "Country Report: Canada," pp. 37-51; "The American Learning Enterprise in Transition," p. 79; "Country Report: New Zealand," pp. 32-33; "Country Report: United Kingdom," pp. 4, 33; and "Country Report: The Netherlands," p. 33.

[14]Alternatives to Universities, p. 33.

[15]"Non-University Forms of Higher Education: Canada," pp. 7-8.

[16]Anne Marie Fetveit, "Alternatives to Universities in Higher Education. Country Study: Norway" (Paris: OECD, September, 1988), pp. 45-46.

[17]Peter Scott, Editor, Times Higher Education Supplement, quoted in Tom Schuller, The Future of Higher Education (Buckingham, England: SRHE and Open University Press, 1991), p. 57.

[18]Ibid., p. 58.

[19]Barbara Turlington, "Alternatives to Universities in Higher Education. Country Study: United States" (Paris: OECD, April 1989), p. 38.

[20]Ibid., p. 10.

[21]Jonathan Kozol, Savage Inequalities: Children in America's Schools (New York: Crown Publishers, Inc., 1991), p. 59.

[22]Judith S. Eaton, ed., Colleges of Choice: The Enabling Impact of the Community College (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1988), p. 15.

[23]Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Short-Cycle Higher Education: A Search for Identity (Paris: OECD, 1973), pp. 347-348. The International Meeting on Short-Cycle Higher Education was held November 15-17, 1971, at the University of Social Sciences of Grenoble, France.

[24]Ibid., p. 371.

[25]Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Alternatives to Universities, p. 15.

[26]Ibid., pp. 28, 82.

[27]This discussion of the "third sector" in Japan and New Zealand is based on data in Yoshiya Abe, "Alternatives to Universities in Higher Education. Country Study: Japan" (Paris: OECD, September, 1988), p. 11; and David Lawrence, "Alternatives to Universities in Tertiary Education. Country Study: New Zealand" (Paris: OECD, 1988), pp. 18-19.

[28]Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, Committee on Governmental Affairs, United States Senate, Abuses in Federal Student Aid Programs. 102nd Congress, 1st Session. Report 102-58 (Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1991), p. 33.

[29]Ibid., p. 40.

[30]John Pratt, "Alternatives to Universities in Higher Education. Country Study: United kingdom" (Paris: OECD, 1988), p. 17.

[31]For a prescient discussion of the "ennoblement" of NUS see Dorotea Furth "Short-cycle Higher Education: Some Basic Considerations," in Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Short-cycle Higher Education: A Search for Identity (Paris: OECD, 1973), pp. 13-40.

[32]Ulrich Teichler, The First Years of Study at Fachhochschulen and Universities in the Federal Republic of Germany, Werkstattberichte 28 (Kassel, Germany: Wissenschaftliches Zentrum für Berufs-und Hochschulforschung der Gesamthochschule Kassel, 1990), p. 14.

[33]Ibid., p. 106.

[34]Claudius Gellert, "Alternatives to Universities in Higher Education. Country Study: Federal Republic of Germany" (Paris: OECD, 1989), p. 35.

[35]John Pratt, "Alternatives to Universities in Higher Education. Country Study: United Kingdom," p. 23.

[36]Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Alternatives to Universities, p. 81. For the Japanese principle of "segregation of niches" see Yoshiya Abe, "Alternatives to Universities in Higher Education. Country Study: Japan," p. 52. The Japan Scholarship Foundation monthly yen awards see National Council on Educational Reform, "Further Education and Training of the Labor Force. Country Report: Japan" (Paris: OECD, 1991), p. 10. For Jürgen Habermas's view of the contextual interconnectedness of theory and practice see his Theory and Practice trans. J. Vietel (London: Heinemann, 1974), passim. For the view that higher education provision is essentially professional in nature see Geoffrey Squires, The Curriculum Beyond School (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1987).

[37]Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Alternatives to Universities, p. 81.

[38]Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Short-Cycle Higher Education: A Search for Identity, p. 40.

[39]George Z. F. Bereday, Universities for All (San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, Publishers, 1973), pp. 141-142.

[40]Stuart L. Smith, Report: Commission of Inquiry on Canadian University Education (Ottawa, Ontario: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 1991), p. 115.

[41]Harold Hodgkinson, "Higher Education, 1990-2010: A Demographic View," in Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities, Committee on Labor and Human Resources, United States Senate, American Higher Education and the Future (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1991), p. 135.

[42]Ulrich Teichler, The First Years of Study at Fachhochschulen and Universities in the Federal Republic of Germany, p. 106.

[43]Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Alternatives to Universities, p. 82. An example of recent attention given to FET and NUS by the business community in the United States is the statement by William H. Kohlberg and Foster C. Smith, president and senior vice president, respectively, of the National Alliance of Business, "A New Track for Blue-Collar Workers" (The New York Times, February 9, 1992, F13). State Kolberg and Smith: "To insure that all American workers are educated and trained at world-class levels, businesses must sell the nation that high schools and community colleges must serve the 70 percent of the work force that does not graduate from college. It (presumably, the private sector) must also integrate secondary and advanced learning with entry-level jobs and adopt a philosophy of lifelong learning for workers." (Parentheses added)

PC:16